S FORMS

COMPLAINT

D.

explain why.

26

27

28

appeal at each level of review. If you did not pursue a certain level of appeal,

,	00-00-0	00756-CRB Document 1 Filed 01/31/2008 Page 2 of 8	
		1. Informal appeal	
		2. First formal level	
		3. Second formal level	
		3. Second formal level	
		4. Third formal level	
	E.	Is the last level to which you appealed the highest level of appeal available to	
		you?	
		YES () NO ()	
expl	F. lain why	DIATMETER TO NO LONGED IN THE CHEMODY OF	
		BUTTE COUNT OFFICIALS, HOWEVER ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS WERE FILED AND A DECISION WAS ISSUED	
		BY THE CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL ATTACHED	
20 II. Parties.HERETO			
	A.	Write your name and your present address. Do the same for additional plaintiff	
		if any.	
		MARK EVAN ODELL PLAINTIFF	
	В.	Write the full name of each defendant, his or her official position, and his or her	
		place of employment.	
		SHERIFF BUTTE COUNTY OFFICE OF SHEFIFF BUTTE COUNTY	
		Γ -2-	

Calse 3:08-cv-00756-CRB Document 1 Filed 01/31/2008 Page 3 of 8 OUNTY OF BUTTE 1 NAPA STATE HOSPITAL 2 DOES 1thru 20 3 BUTTE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT 4 Statement of Claim. 5 Π I. State here as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Be sure to describe how each 6 7 defendant is involved and to include dates, when possible. Do not give any legal arguments or cite any cases or statutes. If you have more than one claim, each claim should be set forth in a 8 9 separate numbered paragraph. 10 SEE ATTACHED IN FULL 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 Relief. 23 IV. Your complaint cannot go forward unless you request specific relief. State briefly exactly 24 what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments; cite no cases or statutes. 25 26 PLAINTIFF REQUEST DAMAGES IN THE AMOUNT OF 20 million dollars TO BE AWARDED JOINT AND 27 SEVERLY AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IN THEIR 28 INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL CAPACITIES - 3 **-**COMPLAINT

	alty of periury that		- correct.
F	and to Landau's man		
Signed this	day of	, 20	
		(Plaintiff's signature)	
	,		
LAINT		- 4 -	
		Signed this day of	

MARK EVAN ODell

CSP, San Quentin San Quentin, Ca 94964

Plaintiff Pro Se

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK EVAN ODEL

Plaintiff

Case NO:
CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT
42 U.S. C. SEC 1983
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COUNTY OF BUTTE et al Defendants

JURISDICTION

!. This is a civil rights action authorized by 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, and 28 U.S.C., Section 1381, to redress the depivation under color of state law, of rights secured by the Constitution of the United States. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. Section 1343 and over all pendent law, Plaintiff seeks monetary damages,

Plaintiff proceeds under 28 U.S.C. Section 1915

II

PARTIES TO THE ACTION

PLAINTIFF

1. Plaintiff, Mark Evan ODell was confined in the Butte County Sheriff's facility and again in the Napa State Hospital at all times mentioned in this complaint. He was at all times mentioned herein in the custody of the County of Butte.

Defendants

- 2. Defendant County of Butte employees the Sheriff and the Sheriff staff , likewise the County of Butte is responsible for the actions and /or omissions of all employees of the County of Butte.
- 3. Defendants Napa State Hospital had custody of the Plaint iff through an order of the Butte County Superior Court.

 Officials of Napa State Hospital were responsible for the actions of all persons employeed at Napa State Hospital. Napa State Hospital Officials knew or should have known that they were violating the constitutional rights .
- 4. Defendant Butte County Superior Court knew or should have known that it was violating the Constitutional Rights of the Plaintiff when it sign the Orders mentioned in the complaint.
- 5. Does 1-thru 20 will be named unpon the undertaking of lawful discovery.

All defendants are sued in both their individual and official capacity .

III

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Plaintiff hereby adopts by reference THE Factual
Background , in the Certified Opinion of the Third Appellate
District filed February 3, 2005.

ΙV

CONTENTIONS

Plaintiff contends that the Butte County Sheriff Office violated his constitutional right to freedomm ospeach , plaintif further contends that he was denied due process by the Butte County Sheriffs Office regarding administrative complaints

Plaintiff further contends that the County of Butte
has a policy , practice procedure of allowing its employees
to violate the constitutional rights of persons such as plaintiff

Plaintiff further contends that the policies , practices and procedures were the motivating factors that caused his consitutional injury .

Plaintiff contends that the Napa State Hospital Officials named in the corespondence sent to the Butee County Superior Court knew or should have known that their action would violate the constitutional rights of the plaintiff, and that they took their actions sounded deliberate indifference to the mental health of the plaintiff.

Plaintiff further contends that the hospital staff at Napa state Hospital each and every one of them mentioned in the correspondence to the Superior court and those indentified through lawful discovery knew that thetreatment they provided /adminsitered was not without constitutional limits, and they disregared plaintiiff's constitutional by the forced medication.

Plaintiff further contends that he had a constitutionally protected liberty interest in avoiding the unwanted administr ation of antipsychotic medication under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the hospital officials violated that right .

Plaintiff further contends that the Butte County Superior knew or should have known that the Napa State Hospital Officials were seeking to violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights and took no action to abate this violation.



